SOCIALIST APPEAL

An Organ of Revolutionary Socialism

Published Monthly by Socialist Appeal, 1654 W. 67th St., Chicago, Ill. SUBSCRIPTION: One dollar for 24 issues

Vol. II.—No. 10 NOVEMBER 1, 1936 Price 5 Cents

CONTENTS

Max Shachtman — *Nineteen Years of the Russian Revolution* 3

Edward J. Oakes — *France's Man on Horseback* 5

Carl Pemble, Gardner S. Wells — *On the Labor Party*..... 5

Jack Weber — *War and the Comintern*..... 9

Max Sterling — *A Letter from Spain* 11

Arne Swabeck — *After the A.F. of L. Split*....13

Glen Trimble — *Spain and the Campaign*.....15

Neutrality and Spain

NOTE: As we go to press the newspapers carry dispatches to the effect that the Russian government, while not denouncing the non-intervention agreement, feels free to help the Madrid government by sending arms and ammunition. This, of course, does not mean that arms and ammunition will actually be shipped. Assuming that Stalin is not simply making a gesture in order to deceive the millions of Communist followers who are anxious to help the Spanish workers and peasants, the fact remains that the time is past when airplanes, arms and ammunition can be sent without interference by the fascists.

The fascist nations did not threaten and did not shout neutrality. They sent arms. And that is what counted and thousands of Spanish workers and peasants have suffered and died because the fascist nations acted decisively. The Stalinist regime maneuvered—**not to send arms but to deceive the masses. Had arms been sent at the beginning of the fascist revolt there would have been a different story.**

Revolutionary workers must continue their agitation for arms for the Spanish workers and peasants, not for the Spanish bourgeois democratic government. Upon Blum and especially upon Stalin will fall a large part of the blame if, contrary to all our hopes, the workers of Spain will be defeated. And the victory of the Spanish workers will come, if at all, in spite of Blum and Stalin.

EVERY revolutionary socialist, every class-conscious worker will reject with indignation the idea that he is or can be "neutral" in the question of the Spanish civil war. We stand, without any hesitation or ambiguity whatever, for the complete victory of the Spanish workers and peasants, for the smashing defeat and overthrow of the Spanish fascist bloc.

The victory of the Spanish workers—entirely apart from any problem in abstract moral ideals—is of immediate concern to every section of the international working class. Their defeat means the increased strengthening and consolidation of the forces of finance-capital in every country. The crucial factor is the bolstering of the bourgeoisie **within the democratic nations**—above all in France—and the set-back to the proletariat of these countries, which would follow from a defeat in Spain. A victory in Spain, on the other hand, would lead directly to an upsurge of the proletariat in the democratic countries, and a demoralization in the ranks of reaction. Once again it is above all in France, where the fate of the European working class is now being decided for the period to come, that the repercussions of a victory in Spain would echo, would speed the tempo of events, would promote the immediate offensive of the workers against the Fascists, and the advance toward power and toward socialism.

Kremlin Bureaucrats Favor "Real Neutrality"

With what horror and contempt, therefore, must we observe the conduct of the bureaucrats of the Kremlin since the opening of hostilities in Spain! Weighed against the maintenance of their despotic power and their fat privilege, they find the blood of the Spanish workers and the consequences for the European proletariat worth no more than a series of pious declarations of solidarity and a shipload of corn and bandages. They, the leaders of the first Workers' State, are the most voluble and—according to their own declarations—the only fully sincere upholders of **neutrality:** neutrality, by the shade of Lenin, in the armed climax of the class struggle. With unholy haste, they leapt to sign the non-intervention agreement proposed by British and French imperialism. And, to date, their only criticism of it, their only major "blow" for the Spanish workers, has been—to protest at the "violation" of the pact by agents of imperialism who take their class duties more seriously than these usurpers.

Our criticism of the Soviet bureaucracy is not primarily directed at their signing of the non-intervention agreement, nor even at their maintenance of a position of formal government neutrality, though it is not at all obvious that these—particularly the latter—are required. This is not a question of forms. Diplomatic necessities may have compelled an "official" neutrality position—as in the case, for example, of Italy, Germany and Portugal. What we criticize basically is that the Soviet Union, directed by Stalin and his clique, has failed **in fact** to aid the Spanish revolution. It has not sent arms and airplanes to Spain—and it is **arms,** not bandages or money (of which they have had plenty) that the Spanish workers require. There are, as every government in the world knows, a great plenty of ways in which arms can be supplied, directly or indirectly, under cover of "official" neutrality.

Neutrality and War

But, it is argued by Stalin's spokesmen, violation of neutrality might bring about a general war; therefore the Soviet Union must, in fact as well as form, remain neutral. This argument is absolutely worthless. It may

be remarked in passing that it is not at all clear that neutrality "violations" would bring war any more quickly than it is certain to come in any event (the one-sided violations to date have not done so). The war will not start until at least one coalition of the great powers is ready for it; and then there will be no trouble in finding a suitable pretext—among which neutrality violations might be included. But, far more important: the victory of the Spanish proletarian revolution is far more valuable to the international proletariat **and to the defense of the Soviet Union** than a temporary (and it can only be temporary) delay in the outbreak of war. Even granted that "violations" would bring war in short order, every possible means must be taken to assure the defeat of the Spanish counter-revolution. A Fascist victory in Spain means a tragic and perhaps fatal weakening of the European proletariat, and thus necessarily of the Soviet Union itself, which can in the last analysis, in spite of all the plans and diplomacy and alliances of Stalin, rely only on the proletariat for its defense against imperialism.

From the point of view of Marxists, the first workers' state is the instrument of the international revolution, its greatest victory up to the present, to be utilized as a major weapon in the world socialist revolution. From the point of view of Stalin and his fellow-bureaucrats, the Soviet state is their private happy hunting ground, control of which is the means for the maintenance of their power and privilege, and the end and aim of their political strategy. What then matters the Spanish proletariat?—no more, surely, than the Austrian or German, so long as Stalinism rides high at home. The alliance with French imperialism, a back-handed assurance from the British Foreign Office, are worth a dozen proletarian revolutions. And the full measure of the crime is not understood until we realize that by this "astute" strategy of socialism in one country, they betray not merely the working class in the rest of the world, but undermine the last vestiges of actual defense for the Soviet Union itself, which cannot possibly survive, as a proletarian state, the coming war except through the aid of the world proletariat and successful revolutions in other nations.

Stalin Acts Through Notes

The betrayal, sealed by the anti-revolutionary policy of the Communist party in Spain itself (dedicated to "the defense of democracy and property" as a guarantee to the French imperialist ally), is made only the more contemptible by the recent Soviet note protesting violations of the pact by Italy, Germany and Portugal. This note the serious bourgeois press treated as it deserved: exposing it as a brazen bluff designed to quiet the incipient protest of the Soviet population at home against the Spanish policy, to hold the loyalty of the workers elsewhere who want desperately to help their Spanish comrades, and to further the aims of the C.I. in France. Meanwhile, while the Soviet statesmen grow indignant—and do nothing—finance-capital (and not alone in the Fascist nations) subsidizes and supplies the armies of its class brothers in Spain.

But in France the C.P. pursues a different policy, calling for intervention in Spain and arms and airplanes for the Spanish workers? Not at all a different policy; only another facet of the betrayal. The French state is an **imperialist** state, not a proletarian state, administered it is true by Blum, but no less the executive arm of French imperialism for all its "socialist" coloration. The French state is thus the **enemy** of the French working class and of the world proletariat. It is the task of the French workers to render aid to the workers of Spain, therefore, independently of the government, through their own organizations, the trade unions and the working class political parties The C. P. of France, thus, by calling for **government** intervention and by making the whole issue depend upon the position of the French government, repeats the fatal error of support of government sanctions. That is, it diverts the French working class from their real task of independently organizing aid for Spain, and twists the demand of the French masses that aid should be given into governmental channels, in such a way as to tie them further to the French state, to help in the achievement of national unity in the service of French imperialism. The policy of the C. P., far from actually aiding the Spanish proletariat, is but a step in the preparation for the delivery of the French masses to French imperialism in the approaching war. It is more "provocative" than the official neutrality policy of the Soviet government merely because Stalin is quite willing that war should break out between France and Germany, since in that way the operation of the Franco-Soviet Pact will be guaranteed. The Soviet Union must avoid a clash first between itself and Germany because in the latter case Stalin and all European statesmen know that the French bourgeoisie will tear up the alliance.

Blum Bleeds for Spain

On the other hand, Blum's answer to the C. P.'s "interventionist" agitation is no less dishonorable. It is simply the answer dictated by the French bourgeoisie, who are not yet ready for war, and who naturally are not spending sleepless nights over the fate of the Spanish workers—rather do they pray for their defeat as ardently as Hitler or Mussolini, knowing sufficiently well how great a stimulus a victory in Spain would give to the revolution in France. Blum, by having accepted the job of administering the affairs of French imperialism, cannot act otherwise than as its agent. And his zeal is even greater than the masters of the French state have a right to expect. Not merely does he insist on non-intervention ("to preserve peace"—i.e., to keep the class struggle within bounds at all costs); in addition he boycotts shipments to Spain and thereby prevents the workers' organizations from giving independent aid. Indeed, the whole non-intervention agreement, engineered by Blum in collaboration with Great Britain, as all news reports make completely clear, is nothing else than a mechanism to boycott aid to the Spanish workers and permit unofficial aid to be rendered freely to the Fascists by the agents of imperialism—among whom the dominant section of British finance capital, acting largely through Portugal, has been at least as active as Germany or Italy.

And, tagging their own bourgeoisie, the British Labor party policy parallels Blum's. Instead of organizing aid for Spain, demanding that the British government permit its export, if necessary smuggling it from the country in defiance of the government, the B. L. P. leadership—although waxing duly sentimental over their sympathy with their Spanish brothers—obediently upholds the policy of the government (i.e., the policy of boycott of aid to the Spanish workers), and makes its whole discussion revolve around the needs and interests of the British imperialist state "in the present crisis."

No: The success of the Spanish revolution depends first on the Spanish working class, on the advance to a revolutionary policy in Spain directed toward power and the proletarian dictatorship. In this struggle the duty of revolutionists elsewhere is—**no** neutrality; all aid to the Spanish workers and peasants. Aid, first as always, by the revolutionary prosecution of the class struggle within their own country. But immediate aid also by demanding that the Soviet government, with all its vast resources, send munitions (by whatever means) to Spain. And, in the capitalist nations, aid through the working class organizations, in complete independence from and struggle **against** the bourgeois governments, to prove to the workers of Spain by deeds as well as words the meaning of revolutionary internationalism.

Nineteen Years of the Russian Revolution

BY MAX SHACHTMAN

NINETEEN years of the most radical change any section of humanity has ever undergone, require that stock be taken and a balance sheet cast up. Summary, provisional, and even partial though it may be, it will establish that the Russian Revolution, whatever its course in the immediate future, has been a tremendous plus for the development of society.

The Russian Revolution precipitated an early end to the World War, the most frightful shambles known in history.

It brought the working class to power for the first time, and proved that the toilers, despised and ridiculed as men and women fit only for drudgery and the production of profit for a select few, are vastly more capable of conducting and managing the affairs of a social order than are the parasites they cast off their backs. The Revolution brought to the surface treasures of resourcefulness, initiative, energy, social instincts and devotion which had lain dormant in the masses of the people and had only waited for their revolutionary release from the stifling upper crust of capitalist rule.

Its "working existence" gave the crushing answer of life, of social practise, to the hitherto far less real disputes between the proponents of capitalism and the advocates of socialism, on the one side, and between the advocates of reformist theory and practise in the labor movement and the defenders of revolutionary Marxian theory and practise, on the other. It became the living criterion by which all other movements, inside and outside the working class, could be measured; and when they were, they were found wanting. One has only to bear in mind the comparison: Some two decades of a "revolution" led by the classic party of social reformism, the German, brought to power a regime which is cursed and hated the world over. The Soviet State, with all its defects and tragedies, is nevertheless regarded to this day, even by its sharpest critics, as a historical social achievement that must be defended from its capitalist enemies by workers everywhere.

Revolution Brought Planned Economy

Despite its isolation from world economy, despite the indescribably mean heritage of czarism and years of paralyzing civil war, the Bolshevik Revolution brought Russia to heights of productive development which capitalism, given similar circumstances, could never have attained in the same period of time. In the course of doing this titanic job, the Revolution coined the magic phrase and the magic reality of Planned Economy—the greatest contribution that the proletarian revolution, that socialism makes to the advancement of the human race. Bringing the working class to power, the Revolution established the fact that the people can so coordinate their social-economic efforts for the production and exchange of the necessities, the comforts, and even the luxuries of life, as to make them available to all. The principle of planning can be realized only by cutting down at the root the private ownership of property, with its attendant production for the market, that is, anarchic production, with the concomitant evils of exploitation, poverty, unemployment, wars and other social pestilences. When it is realized, it promptly demonstrates its tremendous economic and social superiority over planless capitalism.

One needs very little imagination to understand that if the Soviet Union has been able, with planned economy, in a single country, to make its prodigious advances despite a hostile capitalist circumference and a parasitic bureaucracy, then, together with the rest of the world, it would be able to catapult society to a hitherto unrealizable stage of culture and comfort if planning were worldwide. If only there obtained an international socialist division of labor, if only the natural resources, the technological equipment and the man-power of the world could be organized from one central point! The Russian Revolution, in this decisive sphere, has given us a breathtaking glimpse of tomorrow's Golden Age of Humanity.

Birth of New International

The Bolshevik Revolution saved the honor of the international labor movement. It came into being when the International was split into warring national sections—warring against each other for Kaiser or Mammon—its shield stained, its banner trailed in trench-mud, its principles traded for a recruiting sergeant's uniform. It not only revived the International, but brought it back to the granite foundations of revolutionary Marxism and gave it the physical materials and the spiritual content that made it an awe-and-fear-inspiring edifice. Together, the Revolution and the new International brought hope and confidence again to the masses in despair. It resumed, seriously, determinedly, the work begun by the great guides of the proletariat, Marx and Engels. It brought millions of prostrated workers to their feet. It did something that no other movement had ever done: it aroused the yellow, brown and black slaves of imperialism's colonial domain to such a point of revolutionary fervor and clarity as shook the very keystone of world empires and threatened for a time to collapse them forever.

This side of the balance sheet could be extended almost indefinitely. But enough has been said to indicate the unprecedented contribution to human progress already made by the Russian Revolution. Even if some hideous catastrophe should overtake the Soviet Union tomorrow, even if a cruel turn of events should hurl its population back to the thralldom of capitalism, the Russian Revolution would already have implanted itself so firmly in recorded history that its historical greatness could never be eradicated and its social achievements would remain a subject for study and emulation.

Isolation is Weakness

The other side of the balance-sheet is, however, not so roseate. The Achilles heel of the Russian Revolution has always been its isolation. Exactly four months after the Bolshevik insurrection, Lenin aserted that "the absolute truth is that without a revolution in Germany we will perish"; and for the thousandth time he repeated this absolute truth by saying in 1921 that "before the revolution and also after it, we thought that the revolution either immediately or at least very soon will come also in other countries, in the more highly developed countries, otherwise we will perish." The authentic architects of the Russian Revolution never forgot for a moment that left to its own forces—no matter how heroic—it would degenerate and crumble.

The ugliest expression of this peril to the Revolution is the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union and the Third International. At once its theoretical rationalization and sign of its nationalistic decay, is the doctrine of "socialism in a single country." Starting from the indubitable **fact** that the revolution in other countries was

delayed in coming and that Russia remained for the time being the only fortress of the proletariat, a conservative Soviet bureaucracy consolidated itself around the conception that this temporary state of affairs must not only be accepted, that Russia must not only adapt herself to it, but that it must be **perpetuated** in the alleged interests of concentrating on the internal development of the Soviet Union.

Working from this conception, the new rulers of Russia have pursued a course in the last thirteen years which has wrought havoc not only upon the revolutionary and labor movement of the capitalist world, but upon the Soviet Union as well. The long period of the rise of Stalinism is coincident with the work of liquidating—in recent times at an accelerated speed—the achievements of the Russian Socialist Revolution.

Communist International a Brake

In order to preserve a national Utopia, where poverty still rubs shoulders with bureaucratic privilege under the all-hallowing label of "our socialist, classless society," the foreign extension of the Soviet officialdom, still retaining the name of "Communist International," has been converted into a series of tight brake bands around the world revolutionary movement. Launched for the purpose of wiping out the diplomatic Latin pseudonym for modern capitalism—the "status quo"—the Comintern has been transformed into the most zealous attorney and man-at-arms of the "status quo," that is, of the "state of things as they are," that is, of the rule of bankrupt, putrescent capitalism. A blow at the Soviet Union is a blow at the international proletariat. Conversely, an abandonment of the world's labor and revolutionary movements is equivalent to disarming and demobilizing the indispensable auxiliary forces of the Soviet Union. By turning the Third International into the shock troops of bourgeois "democracy," Stalin strikes a double blow: at the working class under capitalism and at the working class under Sovietism.

That gradual, systematic, fascinating work, begun under Lenin, of putting a socialist foundation under agriculture, of slowly and intelligently removing the age-old private property desires and individualistic instincts of the peasants (in order, thereby, to eliminate the strongest social-economic base for the restoration of capitalist property in general), of carefully but surely instilling the peasant with a **socialist** consciousness, has now been reversed by Stalin. The peasants are being given the land "in perpetuity"—in categorical opposition to the spirit of the Russian Revolution and its first Constitution. Their every latent feeling of individualism, of property ownership, is being systematically stimulated, The shibboleth of the day on the land is: "Accumulate! Become well-to-do!"

Retreat on all Fronts

A no less significant change is occurring in the cities, in the factories. Behind a well-laid barrage of sneering at "petty bourgeois equalitarianism" (with the inevitable inappropriate quotations from a defenseless Marx), an increasingly wide gap is being hewn between the general mass of the workers, on the one side, and a Stakhanovist aristocracy of labor plus a highly privileged stratum of bureaucrats, on the other. The contrast has developed to such an alarming point that a returned American socialist can write (alas! with so much justification) that "the difference in standard of living between the privileged stratum and the rest of the population of the Union is about the same as, in old Russia, between the life of the nobles and that of the ordinary people." In the factories themselves, the unions have become caricatures of what they were; control by factory committees has been ruthlessly abolished and the "Red director" reigns supreme, with unchallengeable authority; the workers have been long deprived of the right to strike which was guaranteed them under Lenin—formally and solemnly guaranteed by a Communist party congress.

The Stalinist plague has even passed over the field of social legislation, in which Russia once stood proudly at the head of **all** nations, no matter how progressive, democratic or powerful. Capital punishment, for example, always an abomination to socialists, admissible only in such emergencies as a civil war would constitute, has not only been preserved, but extended to cover a multitude of offenses—extended, it is hard to believe! even to offending minors of the age of 12. The new law on abortion is another of Stalin's heinous reversals of the policy and spirit of the great revolution, a reversal which even some of the professional "Friends" of the Soviet bureaucracy found it difficult to swallow.

Soviet Democracy a Memory

Party and Soviet democracy are the dimmest memories. Woe to him who, remembering the Lenin epoch, dares to rise to his feet in criticism of the bureaucracy, and its newly-dubbed Marshals! Party congresses are held or not, as the officials decree; and if held, they are like circus parades in which the performers go listlessly through their prepared acts. In Scriptures, man at least proposes, even if God disposes. In the Soviet Union, Stalin alone proposes and disposes. The elite of the struggle against czarism, of the revolution, of the civil war, organized into the once admirable Communist party, has been dissolved into a doughy mass, out of which the bureaucratic yeast brings to the top only the careerist, the sycophant and toady, the place-hunter on the make. The Old Bolsheviks, who really symbolized and incarnated the authentic socialist revolution? Remorselessly, with that rudeness and disloyalty for which Lenin excoriated him, Stalin has cut them down, and with them the flower of the revolution. The Society of Old Bolsheviks—dissolved. The League of Red Partisans (militants of the civil war period)—dissolved. League of Former Political Prisoners—dissolved. Young Communist League—dissolved, and replaced by a "non-party" organization forbidden to engage in politics. Lenin's collaborators, for twenty years or more, **all of them without exception**—dissolved by the unspeakable cruelties of Stalin's prison regime or by moral disembowelment into groveling capitulators or by the classless bullets of a socialist firing squad.

This is the record of the other side of the balance sheet, the record made by the Stalinist bureaucracy, the liquidators of the socialist revolution. The economic foundations of that revolution still remain, not intact, it is true, and overgrown with weeds and poisonous fungi. But the bureaucratic structure set down upon that foundation threatens to crush it entirely. If it is to be saved, the bureaucracy must be overthrown, just as a reactionary officialdom must be removed from control of a trade union if that organization is to survive and flourish as a genuine labor body.

Triumph of Russian Revolution

This necessarily brief survey can lead to pessimistic conclusions only one who has never been deeply associated with the proletarian movement or who has never understood it. Big Bill Haywood called the Russian Revolution the biggest general strike in history. In a sense, he was right. Sometimes, strikes are temporarily defeated, and with them the trade unions. Sometimes, the latter are wiped out for a time, either because of the superiority of the capitalists' forces, or because of a weakness of the union deriving from erroneous policy, incompetent or treacherous leadership. How stupid and dilletante it would be, then, to conclude, for example, that there is no point in attempting to organize the steel workers into unions because it was tried in 1919 without immediate success.

And the Russian Revolution cannot even be compared with, let us say, the great steel workers' strike of 1919. The latter was defeated; it failed. The former has neither been defeated nor failed. It is still, we are profoundly convinced, filled with life, potentialities, resources that merely need touching off to re-assert themselves. The revolutionary socialist cannot be like those who thought the problem was all at once settled the day the Bolsheviks took power. The key to the solution of the problem lies, for us, in the extension of the revolution throughout the capitalist world. Its triumph means the real triumph of the Russian revolution, the basic answer to the problems besetting it. There is no other way.

Has France Found Her Man on Horseback?

BY EDWARD J. OAKES

FRANCE, occupying a key position in Europe and in the world, a country with a tradition of revolutions, has crossed the threshold of her greatest and most significant revolution. It began with the tremendous strikes in June, coinciding with the accession of the **Front Populaire** to power. To the casual observer, things are still comparatively calm in Paris and the provinces. The only immediate result seems to be the tremendous growth of the official communist movement and the trade union movement. The Communist party and the Young Communist League together have well over 300,000 members, two-thirds of which they have recruited since the beginning of the year and half of which has been recruited since June. The claim of the Communist party that it receives 1,000 new applications every day does not appear to be an exaggeration to one who has spent a month in travelling about France. The C.G.T. (Confederation Generale du Travail) has grown from something less than 1,000,000 members before the strikes to almost 5,000,000 members today, representing a majority of the French proletariat.

Behind these bare statistics there are tremendous social forces at work, which even threaten to sweep away the organizations that are at present benefiting from them. French economy, founded upon an imperialist domination far out of proportion to the basic strength of French industry, has proceeded steadily from bad to worse. French hegemony in Europe is cracking under the steady pressure of a German imperialism that has put its internal house in order and is basically far stronger than French or even British imperialism. French trade, internal and foreign, has dwindled to a small fraction of what it was in 1929. The rising cost of living, much more rapid now that the capitalists have gotten over their fright in June and are meeting the increased wages with increased prices (bread, newspapers, all the necessities rise in price from week to week, while the gold reserve decreases), is causing an unrest in France that is comparable to the unrest that seized Spain two or three months before the civil war broke out. Not even the super-exploitation of 80 million colonial peoples can maintain the profits of the French capitalists.

Rising Revolutionary Tide

The normal lull following the first great revolutionary wave of masses in action has not been so marked, due to the repercussions of nearby civil war in Spain. Everywhere in France there are tremendous meetings. Everyone talks politics—the factory worker, the railroad mechanic, the chambermaid, the bartender, the taxi driver, the small shop proprietor, the banker. The politician is in his glory, for he can always obtain an audience. The strike wave spread to the country and the provinces, awakening the peasant and the agricultural worker to political consciousness. It is now preparing to flow back to the cities, and with it will inevitably come the downfall of the **Front Populaire.** Hundreds of French workers, enraged at the support given to the Spanish fascists by Germany and Italy, are streaming across the border to fight side by side with the heroic Spanish proletariat.

The Blum government is powerless to check the rising revolutionary tide. Already two distinct processes that foretell the coming bloody clashes in France (which the outbreak of war could ony postpone) are discernible. On the one hand, the Communist party, although the main beneficiary of the leftward movement of the masses, is finding that it is beginning to lose control of the masses. Its most class conscious elements are joining the P.O.I. (Parti Ouvrier Internationaliste), French section of the Fourth Internationalists (Trotskyists). Its most backward members, desirous of action, are swinging to the extreme right. Thus, although the Communist party will continue to grow during the next few weeks, this process of growth is beginning to taper off. On the other hand, the fascist movement is growing steadily. The recent by-election at the end of August in the 17th **arrondissement** of Paris, a predominantly working class district, saw the election of Chiappe, former police prefect of Paris and an outstanding reactionary, to the Chamber of Deputies by an overwhelming majority. Chiappe polled approximately 5,000 votes out of a total vote of less than 7,000. Soon the greater part of France will be two hostile camps, ready to die in the struggle to prevent the other from coming to power.

The famous "200 families" have been looking for their savior, their Hitler or Mussolini, ever since Feb. 6, 1934, when de la Rocque's armed bands demonstrated to them the possibilities of achieving a fascist solution of the crisis. But de la Rocque failed due to his own lack of personal qualification. A fascist leader in a country with a strong working class movement must be a popular figure, a good speaker, a man who has emerged from the masses and can rally them under nationalistic and demagogic slogans—and de la Rocque has none of these qualifications. He is the typical hard-boiled army captain. He can play the role of a Goering, but never that of a Hitler. But de la Rocque also failed due to the efforts of Doriot, "le grand Jacques" of Feb. 9 and 12, 1934, the same Doriot who today is enthusiastically supported by the French capitalists and given front page publicity on every possible occasion by the "'grande presse."

French Capitalists Look for Fascist Savior

Who is this Doriot, who on Feb. 9, 1934 went into the streets with the slogan, "Unity or Death"—a cry that reached every town and village, every corner of France, for it corresponded to the desires of the masses, and resulted in the general strike of Feb. 12, 1934 that put a stop to fascism for the time being and led ultimately to the formation of the **Front Populaire?** Who is this Doriot, the object of the most popular (though unofficial) slogan of Bastille Day, July 14, of this year—"Doriot au poteau" (which means "Hang Doriot"); the most talked about man in France today?

Jacques Doriot, the mayor of St. Denis, a working class suburb of Paris, joined the communist movement in

France from its inception in 1920. He was the leader of the Young Communist League, a house painter by trade (not the least of his resemblance to Hitler), a man of great personal bravery, a powerful speaker and writer, and a born organizer of masses. When he graduated to the ranks of the Communist party, he accepted the bureaucratization of the party and with his personal qualifications forged rapidly to the front. He became the most popular figure in the Communist party, second in command to Cachin, a member of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, Stalin's emissary to China in 1927.

Two things distinguished Doriot in his period as a power in the Communist party. Always a loyal bureaucrat, during the crazy zigzags of the party, he showed a decided preference for the opportunist course of the Communist party rather than its sectarian manifestations. And, above all, Doriot kept in close contact with the masses.

Thus, after the events of February, 1934, he realized before the other Communist party functionaries the tremendous desire of the masses for unity. In March, 1934, Doriot proposed a united front with the Socialist party. The Communist party, however, still regarded the social democrats as social-fascists. Doriot was invited to Moscow to "discuss" the situation. But Doriot knew what happened to people who disagreed with the party line and went to Moscow to "discuss." He refused and was forthwith expelled, only to find that the Communist party concluded a united front with the Socialist party two months later.

From Communist Party to Fascism

Doriot's path from his expulsion from the Communist party to his formation of the P.P.F. (Parti Populaire Francais) at the end of June, 1936, was a confused one. Like all expelled members of the Communist party, if he wished to remain actively engaged in politics, he had to analyze for himself the reasons for the false line of the Comintern, the reasons for its bureaucratization and degeneration. A successful Marxian analysis of his past would have led him to basic agreement with Trotsky's position. Failing this, he has turned toward the road that led to fascism—the road of so many renegades from the working class movement: Mussolini's road, made popular in France by such types as Laval.

Doriot, like so many trained in the Stalinist school, could not overcome his bureaucratic past. True, he came out with his paper, L'EMANCIPATION, which bore the emblem of the hammer and sickle, and flirted with such right centrist organizations as the German S.A.P. (Socialist Workers party) in its fake anti-war meetings. But he supported the **Front Popu'a're**, and his opportunist leanings led him steadily to the right.

The decisive turn in his personal evolution came during the elections. He made a secret bloc with Laval. This had been prepared by his discussions with the agents of Hitler and Mussolini. Doriot still denies this, but the proofs are ample, most conclusive being the course of his subsequent evolution. From an important personage in the communist movement, Doriot has become France's number one fascist.

The French Popular party was born in St. Denis on June 28, 1936 with a good 10.000 members, most of them workers. Doriot broke with the **Front Populaire,** claiming that it is dominated by the Communist party, agent of Moscow. The first issue of his paper after the formation of the French popular party graphically portrays Doriot's change from red to white in the masthead. Formerly L'EMANCIPATION, it is now L'EMANCIPATION NATIONALE. The hammer and sickle has been dropped. In place of the confused ideas of workers groping for the truth, is to be found the conscious, nationalistic, demagogic, anti-communist line of the typical fascist.

At first the victim of a blind, unreasoning hatred of the Communist party and Stalin, Doriot's line has become clever and subtle, but nonetheless clearly fascist. Taking advantage of the nationalistic propaganda of the Communist party, Doriot has become the real French patriot. His slogans are: "Against Social Conservatism" and "Against Foreign Interference." Behind these ambiguities is a definite line. Doriot is against the class struggle, against communism, against soviets. Like the real fascist leader, he is also against capitalism—"but the best features of capitalism must be maintained." as well as France's colonies. "Socialism is not realizable," says Doriot, and "Stalin and his theories are not worth a single drop of French blood." Doriot poses as the "national revolutionary" of France, just as Hitler did in Germany.

C. P. Mistakes Aid Doriot

Like Hitler, Doriot is profiting greatly from the nationalistic degeneration of the Communist party. Many Communist party workers have gone over to Doriot. In Marseilles, he was joined by Sabiani, a former member of the Central Committee of the Communist party. About 40% of de la Rocque's followers are alleged to have gone over to Doriot. After two months in business as a fascist leader, Doriot claims over 50,000 members. A man of indefatigable energy, he is continually on the go, touring the country, speaking.

Doriot never speaks to an empty seat. Even in Paris, on occasions when his audience is predominantly bourgeois, he rolls up his sleeves, takes off his coat and tie, and with his shirt open at the collar, his powerful, sturdy figure bellows his imprecations against communism and his readiness to die in the struggle to save France from the "red menace." No wonder the bourgeoisie supports Doriot in every conceivable manner. Especially do they love to hear him rant against the Soviet Union.

Nobody knows the working of the Communist party better than Doriot. His propaganda is calculated to confuse the workers by mixing together truths, half-truths and untruths—and thus leading the masses to fascism and against communism. At every meeting, without fail, he launches into his attack on the Soviet Union and Stalin. Stalin, according to Doriot, is the real master of France today. He is using France as a pawn in his game for world power. By making France oppose Germany, Stalin will have a free hand in Asia to deal with Europe and conquer the world, thus fulfilling Stalin's "all-consuming ambition." Mixed with this fantastic appraisal is a more or less truthful analysis of the growing inequalities in the Soviet Union, Stakhanovism as mere speedup, etc., from which Doriot draws the correct conclusion that this is not socialism, and the incorrect conclusion that everything in the Soviet Union is bad and that socialism is not attainable.

Doriot's fascist line is seen even more clearly in his attitude towards other fascists. Of de la Rocque Doriot has no criticism except to say that "De la Rocque failed because his program was not social enough." He was already an admirer of Hitler and Mussolini. The Spanish civil war has forced him to come out openly for reconciliation with Germany, renewing his admiration of Hitler's attempts to save the world from Bolshevism.

It is no secret that Doriot is now receiving financial support from the big capitalists. He claims to circulate over 300,000 copies of his weekly paper. He has had a pamphlet put out, entitled "Doriot, The Man of Tomorrow," replete with pictures and praise of Doriot, the leader. The final proof of his anti-working class posi-

tion, which marks his irrevocable break with the labor movement, is that Doriot has armed bands which roam the streets and break up workers' meetings, attacking the vendors of workers' newspapers. In his gangsterism, Doriot is particularly vicious against the Trotskyists, for small though they are, Doriot knows enough to realize that the Trotskyists are the only consistent Marxian revolutionaries in France today. At present, Doriot is increasing his activities as a strikebreaker, calling upon the workers not to strike.

Big Capitalists Behind Doriot

The Communist party realizes the danger that Doriot represents and has organized a campaign for Doriot's resignation as Mayor of St. Denis. What effect it will have remains to be seen, but already Doriot, formerly the idol of every worker in St. Denis, now leaves his City Hall by the back door and goes around with a bodyguard.

Will Doriot take power and crush every workers' organization, stamping out the revolutionary movement in France under a bloody fascist terror? That is impossible to say at present. The political scene changes rapidly in France and there are many difficulties lying in Doriot's road to power. He has entered upon the fascist scene very late, at a time when the French masses are predominantly revolutionary and moving steadily leftward. In his favor is the nationalistic, class-collaborationist policy of the **Front Populaire** and its leaders, which is paving the way for fascism. The day when Doriot merges with de la Rocque (who has continued in operation with only formal dissolution of his fascist leagues under the euphemistic disguise of the French Social party) will signify the immediate preparation of the fascist counter-revolution. Whether de la Rocque will consent to play Goering to Doriot's Hitler also remains to be seen. In any case, the answer lies not so much with Doriot, but rather with the French proletariat. If the French proletariat succeeds in building a mass revolutionary party before Doriot builds a mass fascist party, the inevitable disintegration of the **Front Populaire** will lead to a Soviet France rather than a Fascist France.

ON THE LABOR PARTY

NOTE: The following is a continuation of the discussion of the Labor party begun in the July issue of the APPEAL.

CARL PEMBLE writes:

IT IS our task to build a leadership for revolution. This cannot be done by refusing all positions of leadership now, but by leading the workers in their struggles for immediate demands, while refusing responsibility for any **program** less than a socialist program. At their present stage of development, the unions of farmers and industrial workers can work with socialists, and even under socialist leadership for the attainment of specific objectives compatible with the aim of the Socialist party. Socialist leadership of a Farmer-Labor party or any reformist political party is out of the question. History has shown (and not only in Minnesota) that such leaders soon forget their socialism. The united front on specific issues is much superior to a permanent labor party.

* * * *

"Building the S.P. while building and thru building a Labor party" apparently means that a large section of the Labor party is to be absorbed into the S.P. after learning by experience in the Labor party that the S.P. is necessary, and the F.L.P. inadequate without it. Of course it is not necessary to organize the F.L.P. in order to discover these workers. If they do not become disillusioned with the F.L.P., there is no likelihood of their joining the S.P. If they do become disillusioned, why should they turn to those who advised building the F.L.P.? To the ordinary worker, advocacy of a F.L.P. by socialists means that the socialists have not the courage of their own convictions, and faith in their own party.

* * * *

The Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota rose out of the trade unions, and is today largely based on them. Also federated in the party are other workers' and farmers' organizations, and ward clubs of individual members. These are represented in central bodies and conventions. As is inevitable, it has become the stamping ground of "politicians." Socialists, communists and I.W.W.s became leaders in this party, and became opportunist politicians. It will be pointed out by advocates of the Labor party that mistakes were made, that the S.P. was not held intact as an independent unit, etc.

"But," it will be said, "the F.L.P. of Minnesota is not the kind of a third party we are going to build. Criticism of it is not pertinent." Perhaps it is not the kind of a party you intend to build, comrades, but the F.L.P. of Minnesota is not a fond hope, but a reality and it will have more influence on the coming F.L.P. than you will have. Every F.L.P. conference is oriented towards it. Don t react against objectivity to the extent of applying christian science to politics.

The fact is, that if the S.P. participates in the building of a Farmer-Labor Party with the attitude now prevailing in the party the case of Minnesota will be repeated.

Wisconsin Example

Wisconsin comrades started out "according to Hoyle" in the case of the Wisconsin Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation. Then they dropped the federation idea for individual membership. They were confident of their power in the federation, being the only highly organized force in it. They failed to put up a candidate for governor within the federation, and instead prepared to support Phil LaFollette. This amounted to abandonment of socialist agitation. They demanded that he join the federation and stand on its platform. Then came the Oshkosh convention. LaFollette thumbed his nose at the federation, refused to join and wangled "production for use" out of the platform; and the federation supported him by nominating no one. That left the Socialist party free to run a candidate for governor but it failed to do this. The Labor and Socialist Press Service says of Wisconsin: "The original agreement leaves the socialists free to support Norman Thomas and George A. Nelson." Congratulations, comrades!

The advocates of building a Labor party will also point out the mistakes made in Wisconsin and say we must avoid them. In fact, everything in the way of a F.L.P. that has to date taken concrete form is not acceptable to any Socialists not already entangled in it. It is time we stop endorsing air castles and start looking critically at realities. The F.L.P., in spite of the efforts of radicals in it, will be built largely around certain politicians. The unavoidable lack of discipline determines that. The "chances of election" will largely determine the choice of candidates.

Attitude to Existing Labor Party Determined by Conditions

This is no brief for remaining aloof from a Farmer-Labor party. **Tactics** in this regard must be constantly adjusted to conditions. The important thing is our **attitude** toward the F.L.P. We cannot commit ourselves to the idea that a F.L.P. will be of benefit to the workers, now, and from now on. Much valuable evidence has accrued since the Cleveland convention and will continue to materialize in the future, and we must keep our minds open to consider it. If we really act as revolutionary Socialists in the F.L.P., we may well find ourselves opposing it. We may find that we have to expose its fallacies to such an extent as to completely discredit it. He who denies these possibilities is indeed dogmatic and worse than sectarian. We must maintain a critical attitude. Only thus may we retain our "organizational identity and independence." The danger lies in participating in a F.L.P. without this attitude.

The question is not simply that of working in the F.L.P. "in order to expose it" or "in order to build it." Proper tactics will expose it if it is bad and build it if it is good. We want to build for the benefit of the working class. We must always be ready to reject anything else, regardless of whether we, or anyone else, are building it.

Will Opposition Mean Exclusion?

Fear that opposition to a Labor party may close all doors to us is a confession of lack of self confidence. The S.P. has never hesitated to criticize the craft form of the A.F. of L. and we are still in the A.F. of L. Even the communists, who attempted to split the A.F. of L. and build a dual organization, cannot be kept out. Our members are in the unions. This F.L.P. is to be a federation of unions, etc., so we will be in it in spite of the devil and all his politicians. An incident in Minnesota illustrates this. A member of the F.L.P. was elected to the county central committee from his ward club. He was too progressive and was bounced out of the central body. He joined the Socialist party. Then his union affiliated with the F.L.P., and he was elected its delegate to that same central body. They wanted to bounce him again, but were blocked by the union. He is in a position to put forward the Socialist position. As it is repeatedly rejected, and as the position becomes clear to the more developed members, a desire for socialist leadership will grow and result in recruits for the S.P. If the socialist position is accepted the dreams of the F.L.P. advocates will be on the road to realization. Note that whether this tactic builds or exposes the F.L.P. depends on the F.L.P. and not on the socialists. A fight to keep socialists out would cause an alignment of left wing farmer-laborites with the socialists. In fact, when the correct tactics are pursued, such an alignment will result every time we encounter opposition from the F.L.P. Should tactical considerations dictate affiliation of the S.P. with the F.L.P., such affiliation would be very difficult to refuse. Refusal would place the S.P. in an advantageous position.

California and the Farmer-Labor Party

GARDNER S. WELLS writes:

The Farmer-Labor Party is being discussed wherever party members get together for a gab-fest. There has been all too little discussion, however, of the problems which face its development in specific situations. As one who knows the problems of his own state better than those of any other, I wish to discuss my specific area.

The slogan of the Farmer-Labor party must be considered in two lights. First, the class loyalties of the workers and the farmers. Second, the road to power.

In California we face the first problem in its gravest form. We find a major part of the proletariat to be agricultural workers. They are in constant conflict with the land owners, including the working farmers. Can we bring them both into the same party without having them constantly at each others throats in a struggle for inner-party power? Can we expect them to carry on a fight for a common program? Perhaps we could if their differences were without immediate importance, but the agricultural worker must struggle against the farmer in order to gain sufficient food to keep body and soul together until he goes on relief the next winter. The small farmer, on the other hand, squeezed between the banks and the workers, must relieve the pressure in the weakest spot, the agricultural proletariat. This problem is of grave importance to both of them. Neither of them can afford to permit the program to lean toward the side of the other. The mutual battle against the banks must be an extended one, and therefore each of these poorer classes must carry on an immediate struggle against the other. One class—worker or farmer—must lead, and if the farmer ruled the proletariat would find the party too reformist in most matters and reactionary in agricultural matters. If on the other hand, the workers ruled, the farmers would split off, and there would be no Farmer-Labor party.

There is the objection to this argument that "most agricultural workers do not vote." Perhaps that is true. But this is not the important consideration. If we expect the revolution to be brought about by Farmer-Labor party votes, this would be a convincing argument. But if we believe the capitalist class in this country is, as in Europe, ready to resist forcibly any threat to their profits by even a reformist government, we must hold that it is not so much voters that we need, but fighters. If we form a party which, due to virtual disfranchisement of the agricultural workers, serves the immediate interests of the farmers, (small tho they may be) we will be driving away those who should be most willing to struggle under our banner for the unshackling of their limbs. If, on the other hand, we form a pure and simple labor party, we will find ourselves driving the farmer into the ranks of fascism.

It is time for the Socialists to realize that no mass party in America can do as much good as it is certain to do harm. The farmer can be brought to realize that there is no hope for his salvation apart from Socialism. The workers must be brought to realize the same thing. But to bring more than the conscious and active ones into the party is to dilute its realization of the class struggle to such an extent that the masses will become aware of their needs only in time to be disappointed by a government that is Socialist in name only.

We can build a Socialist Party great in influence and in the trust of the masses of the workers and lower middle-class. To now we have largely failed in this. Hence the cry for a Farmer-Labor Party. But there are ways to bring the Socialist message to the masses, and if we have failed it is because we have lacked in analysis and in effort—and now fall back on a farmer-labor party as tho it would save us the trouble of making such difficult analyses in the future.

Thought and action can build Socialist influence. Let us think and act—then the farmer-labor party will be forgotten, as the workers and farmers turn to the Socialists for leadership.

War and the Comintern

BY JACK WEBER

THE PERIOD of so-called successes of Soviet diplomacy, the will-o'-the-wisp diplomacy of "disarmament," of non-aggression pacts and "collective security" fashioned by Stalin-Litvinov, has come to a discordant close. The concluding stages of Hitler's re-armament of fascist Germany permit the Fuehrer brazenly to crusade for a war of intervention to crush the Soviet Union. He chooses as an appropriate cue for shaking the mailed fist the Civil War in Spain, which poses in acute form once again to the bourgeoisie the need for ridding themselves of the dangerous proximity of the USSR—despite all the unsparing efforts of Stalin to give assurances that no real danger to capitalism exists so far as he is concerned. The Litvinov maneuvers, based on the theory that it was possible through the channels of properly conducted diplomacy (the "astute" diplomacy of concessions to capitalism) for the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries to live indefinitely side by side in peace, have ended in a blind alley. Rapidly moving events are forcing the Soviet bureaucracy to improvise a new "line."

The Russian bureaucracy has accepted the inevitability of approaching war and it is clearly orienting its entire policy towards war and the new situations created by war. The entire "line" of the Comintern, internal and external, can be understood only from this political aspect, since the Third International is tied hand and foot to Soviet diplomacy and pursues no independent working-class policy of its own. If the nature of the coming struggle is complicated by the exigencies of the Soviet Union in a world of enemies, it is all the more complicated due to the policies now adopted by the Stalinists. A real defense of the USSR is absolutely unthinkable without a revolutionary policy on the part of the vanguard of the proletariat of the Western European countries. It remains truer than ever before that only the spread and success of the proletarian revolution in other more advanced countries can save the USSR from destruction. Yet less than ever does Stalin pin his faith on the ability of the international proletariat to defend the Soviet Union. Less than ever does or could the bureaucracy demonstrate any desire or any ability to conduct the coming war in revolutionary fashion, against capitalism and for the world's workers. On the contrary the Stalinists base themselves completely on the Franco-Soviet pact; desperately they rely on the treacherous French bourgeoisie to prevent themselves from being hemmed in completely by enemies. Nobody would think of condemning Soviet diplomacy for attempting to secure military allies, particularly in view of the great strength of the opposing military alliance aiming to wipe out the last vestiges of the Soviet system, to restore private property in Russia, and to carve colonies out of a defeated workers' fatherland. It is the criminal political role played by the Soviet apparatus and by those branch offices of Stalinist diplomacy, the "Communist parties" of the various countries, that must be exposed and condemned.

Crumbling of Franco-Soviet Alliance

Since France has become the mainstay of Russian policy, it is precisely in France that the gangrene of Stalinism reveals itself most nakedly. The Russian bureaucracy is far from certain of its French imperialist ally. It is feared, and with the best of reasons, that if the Germans and their allies once start the attack on the Soviet Union, the French bourgeoisie will completely fail its "ally," pact or no pact. The entire strategy of the Stalinists is therefore aimed at preventing the crumbling of the Franco-Soviet alliance, at bolstering it up. The Popular Front became the medium through which the Comintern hoped to maintain the alliance and at the same time prevent the fascist enemies from coming to power in France. This bloc of classes tied the working class to the "democratic" section of the French bourgeoisie that was willing to fight against Germany even at the side of the Red Army. To maintain a powerful military France—under the rule of capitalism of course—the Stalinists declared a truce in the class struggle so that class "differences" should not disturb the harmony of "national unity."

But the class struggle refuses to down despite the zealous efforts of the Stalin cohorts to conjure it away. In the Spanish events we see the struggle for power that is inherent in this imperialist epoch of wars and revolutions breaking out in its most violent form in spite of and through the very Popular Front itself. Should the workers in Spain cast off the treacherous net of the Popular Front and begin to move in the direction of Soviets and proletarian dictatorship, the whole war structure of Stalinism would begin to totter. The Spanish Popular Front would go up in smoke the moment the workers moved to take matters into their own hands, the moment they began to move in the direction of socialism. Immediate consequences would follow in France. The petty bourgeoisie might take fright and break with the left to tie up with the right, thus giving support to fascism. Or the flames of Spanish civil war might set fire to the French tinder-box and start a conflagration on an even greater scale than in Spain. In either case the value of the military alliance from the Stalinist viewpoint would be destroyed. A France torn by civil war would, according to the Stalinists, prove of little help against an immediate attack by Hitler. The French fascists would undoubtedly seek and obtain the help of Hitler, as do the Spanish reactionaries. Hence the utter dismay and consternation of the Russian bureaucrats at the course of events in Spain.

Spanish Revolution Sacrificed

The Spanish Revolution is sacrificed for the supposed benefit of the Soviet rulers under the cloak of peace and defense of the Soviet Union. The Spanish Revolution **must not** become a struggle for soviets and for communism! The DAILY WORKER of Sept. 2nd carries a speech by M. Thorez, leader of the French C.P., in which he says: "About the events in Spain. How many slanders are being poured out daily by the so-called 'information' press.—It seems it is a struggle against Marxism, against Communism, in a land where neither Socialists nor Communists participate in the Government!—It is even said that it is a struggle against an attempt to set up Soviets in Spain.—It is a slander to say that there the fight is for communism, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. No. It is a question of the defense of the Republic. It is a question of the defense of the Republican Constitution against a minority of plotters.—Every day we hear a canard about nationalization. Spain has not confiscated, nor even nationalized. The Republic respects property, even capitalist property in Spain." Thus does the C.P. "struggle" for the maintenance of the **status quo!**

Time now works against Stalinism. France is clearly on the verge of civil war. The skirmishes in the streets are the sure prelude to the pitched battles of tomorrow. The more the French proletariat demonstrates its readiness to fight against capitalism, the nearer the approach of civil war, the greater the nightmare dread of the Russian bureaucracy that a "united" France with great military power will not exist at all when war breaks out. The revolutionizing of the French workers has become a menace to the entire war structure conceived by Stalin-Voroshiloff. To the Comintern the whole question is now posed as a race between the outbreak of war, with France on the side of Russia, or the outbreak of civil war in France with Russia isolated—in the eyes of the present "leaders," who shiver at the thought of their own downfall that would follow on the heels of a successful French proletarian Revolution. The leaders of proletarian defeats put more trust in the French and Polish generals. How l'HUMANITE exulted when the Polish dictator, Gen. Rydz-Smigly, visited Paris, with a "Long live Poland!" (the Poland of capitalist reaction!) The Stalinists are bending every effort to build strong dikes against the class struggle in France. The Popular Front no longer suffices. Now the French Front is proposed to establish "unity" of the entire French nation. Not only is the social-patriotic "sacred unity" of 1914 repeated, but it is repeated by the very same individuals, the Vaillant-Couturiers, the Cachins, etc.! Let none dare quote Liebknecht that the main enemy is at home! The main enemy is Hitler abroad.

Unity of French Nation

A letter of Jacque Duclos, French CP leader, to Louis Marin is quoted in l'HUMANITE of Aug. 14th. Duclos calls Marin to order for slandering the C. P. in saying that it stands for a class struggle policy! "In effect your words could tend only to incite Frenchmen against other Frenchmen. That is, instead of uniting the nation, you work to aggravate the divisions at a moment when the interests of the country demand quite a different thing.—You said that the Communists demand the occupation of the factories. Is this due to lack of information or to a lapse of memory? I don't know, but in any case that assertion has nothing in common with the truth. Further you declared that we communists preach indiscipline in the army and the police forces. To that we answer that we have too great a concern for the interests of our country, whose liberty and independence are threatened by the Hitlerites at home and abroad, not to consider that the army must be capable of fulfilling its role of protecting the country with regard to its liberty. —Let me tell you how regrettable it is to see at the time when we want to unite all people of good will, that at the moment when we have set ourselves to realize the French Front, that some combat this union." In this same issue of l'HUMANITE appears approval of a baldly capitalistic statement by the notorious Caillaux, who says: "We must say that France will tolerate in no case, and no matter what it will cost her, harm to her essential interests." To which the editors reply: "Having expressed this point of view, M. Caillaux cannot but approve the policy of dignity of France and the safeguarding of the peace supported by the C. P., which for this very purpose is working for the union of the French nation!"

Social-patriotism always poses as the lover of peace so as to justify the plea of "defense of the fatherland" made by the capitalists. The peace must be consistent with national "dignity and honor." By adopting this line of betrayal of the working class, the Stalinists have become the defenders of national capitalist boundaries. And as a matter of fact the whole concept of the French Front is unity of those willing to fight against Hitler fascism (a distinction is even made between those fascists who will fight Hitler and those who will aid him!). Thus the DAILY WORKER of Sept. 2 quotes Thorez as saying: "Thus, in a difficult situation at home and abroad, we propose the following for the salvation of our people: 1. A French front for the respect of law, which at the present time can only mean the application of the Matignon agreements, the effective dissolution and the disarming of the leagues, the defense of the Constitution and of all the laws of the Republic. 2. A French Front for the defense of the national economy, which at the present time can only mean assistance and protection for the middle-class elements, support for the peasants, making the rich pay and preventing certain capitalists from sabotaging national production by dismissing their help and closing their plants. 3. A French Front for the freedom and independence of our country, which at the present moment can only mean an active and consistent policy in agreement with all countries which effectively want indivisible peace and collective security. That means that we must indignantly reject all foreign intervention in the affairs of our country." Thorez adds: On these points it is our opinion that we can meet with those who do not agree with the whole of the People's Front program, even if they do not renounce their opinions." Stripped of demagogy all this means is an agreement against Hitler, and nothing more.

Protection to French Colonies

The Stalinists do not fail to promise the French bourgeoisie, for such support, the protection not only of their rule at home but in the colonies as well. Vaillant-Couturier, in l'HUMANITE of Aug. 11, makes clear the danger of losing the colonies to Hitler and Mussolini. And of course he wishes to maintain the blessings of French civilization in Africa! "We who are the advocates of granting the largest democratic rights to the population of Algiers, Tunis, and Morocco, to speak of them only, we are—and by virtue of that very fact—equally resolved to do everything to prevent them from falling under the yoke of foreign fascism. We do not wish at any price to see Hitler installed in Algeria and Mussolini in Tunis, as they are already installing themselves in Spanish Morocco.— Those who refuse to see the amplitude of the Hitlerite operations which are in process of unfolding against France, from the Pyrenees to the coasts of Algeria, those who favor the insurgents and their plots for civil war in North Africa, act truly as traitors to their country." Perhaps the most outspoken statement of all is made on behalf of the Political Bureau of the French CP by Thorez in a speech of Aug. 13th, quoted in l'HUMANITE of Aug. 14th: "In this dramatic situation that is taking place, not only the future of democracy and of peace is threatened by fascism, but also and above all the destiny of France; the CP considers that it is not possible to retreat further before Hitlerite bravado and that it is incumbent to apply an external policy exempt from hesitations and conforming to the will of our people who want peace in honor and dignity."

Thus it is evident that the Stalinists have come to a momentous decision. The only way they can be certain that capitalist France will fight side by side with Russia against Germany, is for France to come to blows with Germany first, so that Russia can come to the aid of imperialist France rather than vice versa. Stalin has no more choice in the matter—except one. To try in some fashion to be sure that France will be on the right side in the war. Only this explains the course of the CI, its utter treachery to the proletariat. The CI is willing to dragoon the workers for the aim of French imperialism, even to defend the French colonies for that imperialism. It is the Stalinists who propose bigger war budgets. It is the Stalinists who welcome effusively the foreign militarists who may become the allies of France in the war.

It is the Stalinists who bolster up all the capitalist institutions that would have to be ground into the dust in order to assure the success of a working class revolution—the army, the police, "law and order," the capitalists' state.

We witness in this manner how the theory of socialism in one country, based on the idea that peace was possible between capitalism and socialism, led progressively to the defense of the **status quo.** This defense of the **status quo** now reaches its culmination in the placing of the parties of the CI completely at the disposal of the bourgeoisie in peace and in war, for national unity and for national defense. In this new policy lies the real explanation for the Moscow trial and for other happenings in the SU. Just as in capitalist countries the certainty of war leads to the most stringent tightening up of the state apparatus against the workers, so in Russia the near approach of war leads to even greater precautions taken by a Bonapartist clique against all possible opposition to their regime, in this case an opposition wholly from the left.

A LETTER FROM SPAIN

BY MAX STERLING

IT IS impossible now to go directly by train from Barcelona to Madrid. One has to go south along the eastern coast to Valencia and then west to Madrid.

The train that goes to Madrid via Valencia used to belong to the Madrid-Saragossa-Alicante Company. Now the large red characters CNT. UGT proclaim proudly that it has been collectivized by the two leading trade unions in Spain, the anarchist-led National Confederation of Labor and the socialist-controlled General Union of Workers. Riding on a collectivized train is adequate preparation for anything that one may see in Valencia, a city of some 400,000 inhabitants.

The civil war has not disturbed to any extent the flow of life, of people filling the streets, or sitting outside of the cafes. But the collectivization has advanced at least as far as in Catalonia. Transport, public services, and many industries have been taken over by the workers' organizations. The militiamen are housed in confiscated hotels and a general supervision has been established. The workers have gotten better conditions, the 40-hour week, a 15 percent increase in wages and a 50 percent decrease in their rents. It was thought in Barcelona that they had even established a complete workers' government but this turned out to be incorrect.

What has been established is an autonomous government. Valencia used to be under the jurisdiction of the Madrid government. Its autonomy is due to the simultaneous character of the Fascist rebellion. The workers' organizations had to take things into their own hands. An army of thousands of militiamen was raised and sent to the front. It was necessary to cope with all the economic problems raised by the civil war. It was necessary to create order out of chaos. In such a situation it was too much to expect any direction from the Azaña government in Madrid. The latter could not solve its own situation without the workers' organizations taking a decisive hand in the conduct of things. In the national chaos, Valencia was left to its fate and as a separate sector it sought to solve the manifold problems, military, economic and political, that confronted it.

Popular Front in Valencia

Reflecting, though inadequately, the part played by the workers in their struggle against Fascism and their intervention in the state of affairs, is the composition of this autonomous government of the province of Valencia whose capital is the city of Valencia. It is called the Popular Executive Committee and has twelve members, eight of whom are from the workers' parties and four from different shades of the parties of the liberal bourgeoisie. There are from the workers' parties and trade unions the following: one from the Socialist party, one from the Communist party, one from the POUM, one from the Syndicalist party, two from the UGT, and two from the CNT.

What is this then but another edition of the Popular Front? But the amazing thing about this Popular Front is the inclusion within it of the anarchists and the Workers Party of Marxist Unification, or the POUM as it is more popularly known. All the other workers' parties, socialist and communist, were known supporters of the Popular Front and hence their participation was not surprising; indeed it was expected. In the case of the anarchists their participation is at once a step forward and perhaps a greater step backward. A step forward because their participation deals a severe blow to their negative attitude towards the state. A great burden will be lifted when by participation in a workers' government the anarchists will cease to give aid to any other kind of government. But if the anarchists in practise give up the idea of being against all government, they should not go to the other extreme and participate in a coalition government with the bourgeoisie. Fortunately the anarchists are not consistent even in this, as will be shown later on.

For the POUM's participation, however, there is no justification. The fact that the bourgeoisie is in the minority is no valid reason. The Popular Executive Committee, in spite of the collectivization and other measures taken to the detriment of the bourgeoisie, measures resulting largely out of the chaos of the civil war and the need to prosecute it, is nevertheless a government within the confines of the bourgeois system, a government of bourgeois democracy. The coalition with the bourgeoisie has meant the subordination essentially to the politics of the liberal bourgeoisie, that is, to the politics of bourgeois democracy.

Bourgeoisie Permitted to Regain Power

The workers' parties must retain their complete independence without for a minute giving up their struggle for proletarian power and socialism, the more so as the bourgeoisie represents no substantial force and plays no real role in the actual struggle against Fascism. On the contrary, it looks in every direction for a compromise and its generals have already been accused of slowing down the campaign against the Fascists.

Furthermore, little by little, the government takes back for itself more and more of the authority formerly exercised by the workers' organizations. In Catalonia, the Generalidad, some weeks ago virtually without any power, now emphasizes that the Central Committee of Anti-Fascist Militias, in which the workers' organizations have a majority, and the Council of Economy composed in the same manner, are subordinate to it. All acts and decrees are issued in its name. The Civil Guard, always unreliable and discredited before the masses, has merely changed its name to the National Guard and its forces are greatly augmented. This has happened throughout Republican Spain.

The National Guard is the instrument of the bourgeois

democratic government and is kept in the capitals fully armed in order to defend this bourgeois democracy. Potentially it is the enemy of the workers if they should attempt to go beyond the confines of this "democracy" but so far have the Socialist and Communist officials degenerated that they have hailed its formation. Another evidence of the attempt of the bourgeoisie to reestablish its power is the recent subjection of all the Catalonian militias now being formed to the authority of the Generalidad. Thus yesterday, in a parade of thousands of militiamen in Barcelona, the usual red and black banners of the workers' organizations were entirely absent and in their place floated hundreds of striped banners of yellow and red of the Catalan government.

Masses Ready for Proletarian Revolution

That the masses are for the proletarian revolution is beyond dispute. But in a large measure they still believe that the Socialist and Communist parties are leading them there. Many of them believe that the occupation of these parties with bourgeois democracy is just a tactic. They do not as yet realize that such capitulatory politics is helping the bourgeoisie to regain its strength every day. The lack of a party with a clear view and intransigeant revolutionary practise, keeps them confused.

An indication of what could be done by such a party is the meeting held by the POUM in Valencia last Sunday. The place of the meeting, one of the large cinemas, was packed with about three thousand persons. Gorkin and Nin delivered very effective speeches in which they attacked the parties that advocate bourgeois democracy. At every exposure of the vacillations and compromise of these parties the audience indicated its awareness by the nodding of heads. Unlike meetings of the other parties the audience here was made to think, and time and again they showed their approval by tremendous outbursts of applause.

All this indicates what could be done, but unfortunately the practice of the POUM itself invalidates some of its good revolutionary criticism. It is difficult to say how the POUM will develop under the pressure of events. It is possible that a Bolshevik force may yet emerge from it. But this much is clear—there is no party comparable to the Bolsheviks of 1917.

Madrid is above all a center of administration. It has a population of about 1,000,000. It does not have the importance economically of Barcelona nor is its proletariat as numerous and advanced. Politically, however, it is of great importance. The manner in which it develops politically is of decisive importance for all of Spain. It is here that the Socialist and Communist parties have their greatest strength. Anarchism has not taken the same hold as in Barcelona. As for the POUM, there are only a few hundred of its members here and some 500 more in the militia at the Madrid front. Thus the field is more or less clear for the Socialists and Communists.

The latter have grown considerably in the recent period and this is testimony to the ripeness of the revolutionary situation. The Communist party, however, does not deserve this confidence, for this so-called party of the social revolution has more actively than all the other parties become the champion of bourgeois democracy. What used to be the Right wing of Prieto in the Socialist party is hardly to be distinguished from the bourgeoisie itself and it is a certainty that it will find itself arrayed against the proletarian revolution.

Caballero Joins Bourgeois Government

But what is one to say of Largo Caballero, this so-called "Lenin of Spain," whose politics is now indistinguishable from that of Prieto's, that is to say, that of the bourgeoisie? Gone are the differences on the nature of the proletarian revolution—and this in a revolutionary situation! It is not at all an accident that side by side in the new government, fatally chained together are the bourgeoisie, Prieto, Caballero and the Communist party. True, this government is more representative of the real relation of forces but like the government that preceded it, its politics is the politics of the bourgeoisie. It is hoped that this government will appease the discontent of the masses particularly as regards the prosecution of the war. What is more shameful is that all the revolutionary initiative of the masses, so admirably demonstrated, is being studiously canalized by it into the channels of bourgeois democracy.

A few days ago there was held in Madrid a parade of about 30,000 workers, militiamen, and the newly formed National Guard. Incredible as it may seem, there was not a single banner with any kind of proletarian slogan in the entire parade. The Socialist and Communist leaders successfully made inarticulate all the strivings and aspirations of the masses, all that they have fought for with so much loss of their blood. On the red banners were only the slogans of "Viva La Democracia," "Viva La Libertad," and "Abajo El Fascismo" (Down with Fascism).

All this was reviewed by a bourgeois general who made a speech to the National Guard as they approached the balcony where he stood. Then the band played the Spanish National Anthem until, yielding to the demands of the crowd who cried for the "International," they played that too. Considerably agumented and fully armed, the National Guard showed its strength. It seemed as though Communist and Socialist leaders were doing their best to re-establish the toppling bourgeoisie and presenting them gratis with the forces that would turn against the working class at a later stage. The POUM with its few hundred supporters would not participate in this sickening show of "democracy and liberty." They held their own parade and in all Madrid only their banners called for workers' power, for proletarians of all countries to unite, for the struggle to the end and for the world revolution. The crowd greeted these slogans with enthusiasm and joined in the cry of "Viva Lenin y Trotsky."

The attitude of the anarchists to the new government in Madrid is, to say the least, extraordinary. They have recognized that it represents a better picture of the relation of forces in the country and they hope that it will use all its means to pursue better the military struggle. But they insist that the need of the hour is a Junta or council (they hate to use the word "government") of workers, peasants and militiamen. Contrary to anarchist doctrine, in some places they have actually done this. This comes very close to what the POUM advocates, but like the latter the anarchists cannot lay claim to any clear and consistent policy. They participated, together with the bourgeoisie in the Central Committee of the Anti-Fascist Militias and the Council of Economy, both of which, in Catalonia, are under the bourgeois Generalidad and they participate in the Popular Front government of Valencia.

Workers' and Peasants' Councils Necessary

Furthermore, it is not sufficient to have such a council from the top. This council must be the result of free elections from councils or soviets previously formed throughout the land. And this must be done immediately, this is really the need of the hour. These soviets and a central power are the only guarantee that the attainments thus far will be kept. They are the only guarantee that the military struggle against Fascism will be firmly and efficiently carried to the end. They are the only guarantee that capitalism, the breeder of Fascism, will be done away with once and for all.

The military struggle against Fascism does not go too well. The "neutrality" farce results only in the continual

arming of the Fascists with the latest and best equipment by Italian and German Fascism. The lack of a class policy inside and outside of Spain by the Communists and Socialists has only resulted in little aid from the world proletariat. Only the latter can really help the Spanish workers but they are hamstrung by their People's Front and a degenerated Stalinist bureaucracy in Russia that pursues more relentlessly the persecution of the October revolutionists than it does its aid to the Spanish working class. So glaring is this degeneration that even members of the Communist party in Spain do not hide their disgust.

One hopes that the proletariat will break through the mass of calumny and deceit in order to judge the present accusers and go forward unhampered in the struggle, against world capitalism and Fascism. The cries of "Airplanes for Spain" must become louder and louder until they burst through the bureaucratic shell; the strikes in the French factories in support of the Spanish proletariat must take on the character of a gigantic wave that will sweep everything before it. The huge bombing planes supplied and flown by Italian and German Fascists must be countered by more and better airplanes supplied by the world working class. All this is possible, the Russian working class can help supply it. What the Fascists have dared, the working class must match with even greater audacity. Whoever stands in the way of this, no matter what he calls himself, is a traitor to the Spanish revolution and to the cause of the world working class.
Madrid, Sept. 7, 1936.

AFTER THE A. F. OF L. SPLIT - WHAT?

BY ARNE SWABECK

THE AMERICAN Federation of Labor is now split wide open. No other interpretation can possibly be made of the action taken by the Executive Council against the Committee for Industrial Organization. Suspension of the ten affiliated international unions took place on September 5; and this is only a prelude to an intense conflict. A new chapter now begins. And it is not difficult to foresee that the conflict so far will have been mere childs' play when we attempt to visualize what is still to come. Now the struggle between the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. begins in earnest. From this point onward it will be in the nature of a struggle for supremacy between two rival movements.

Overtures for a reconciliation may still be made. However the essential issue of the conflict will remain.

But the full significance of future developments will surely extend far beyond the mere struggle for supremacy. Not only does the chapter which has come to a close mark a certain stage of a specific conflict, it also marks the end of a whole historical period of a peculiar type of American trade unionism. Henceforth the center of gravity of the movement will shift to new fields; it will face entirely new problems; it will set new forces into motion, all of which will contribute toward the molding of a new type of unionism. And, we may also rest assured, there will be deep-going changes in the traditional political policy that had become part and parcel of the A. F. of L.

What will be the consequence of this split and these new perspectives for the working class? Will this split retard the movement as a whole, or does it have distinctly progressive features? If the latter is the case and a new and more effective type of unionism arises as its logical outcome, what can then be expected to be its course of development? Above all the question arises: Will this split retard or advance the development of political consciousness among the working masses? For Marxists these questions assume the greatest importance.

Unity and Progress

Mere generalization about the desirability of unity as against splits does not constitute a sufficient answer. Naturally, the maintenance of trade union unity has an enormous advantage for the working class; but this becomes a hollow formula if it is abstracted from the concrete conditions of the movement. On the other hand, it is entirely impossible to agree that trade union unity should be subordinated to the whims of corrupted bureaucrats. In this case, for instance, the C.I.O. unions could have continued to remain within the federation only on the penalty of disbanding this organization. In reality this would mean to abandon the idea of industrial unionism and to give up the organization of the mass production industries. Such was the only alternative. A retreat of this character was not to be expected; nor would it have been desirable. A correct answer to the questions raised above can therefore be given only from the point of view of the historic tasks of the movement. In other words, only a Marxist answer will have real validity.

It is easy enough to agree in advance that this coming struggle for supremacy will possibly carry the devastating effects of internecine warfare. To such possibilities we cannot afford to close our eyes. At the same time this presents only the one side of the picture, and its negative side. More fundamental considerations must be taken into account if we are to understand correctly the perspectives that arise out of the present situation.

The American Federation of Labor, limited to its narrow craft union basis, embraces only a small section of the working class. Its total membership reported for the month of August 1936, is, including the C.I.O. unions, 3,682,224. The overwhelming majority of the workers have remained outside, and they have remained on the whole unorganized. In fact, the A.F. of L. structure, its policies and its methods, made it extremely difficult if not virtually impossible for the masses to join. Craft limitations became one of the factors which made out of it a mere bargaining agency for concessions from capitalism —obtained almost exclusively by virtue of skill. However, with the development of mass production industry, this could only mean that these concessions were obtained in reality at the cost of leaving the masses of unskilled workers, and partly also the semi-skilled workers, almost entirely without organization, and subject to more intense exploitation. By virtue of being bound up directly to the general staff of industry and bound up indirectly to the capitalist political parties, this leadership was motivated in its official policy and in all practical considerations by the idea of a partnership between capital and labor. Collaboration with the employers, according to this scheme of things, proceeded strictly within the framework of capitalism. It was carried on in conformity with the capitalist rules of the game in the most reactionary sense. The unions were not to be conceived of as actual class instruments of struggle of the workers, and they did not really function in this sense. Sell-outs and betrayals by corrupted bureaucrats were made easy. This condition enabled the officials to exert an almost undisputed domination over the unions. In return for concessions obtained, the traditional leadership kept the unions within strictly conservative bounds and thus effec-

tively retarded the development of an independent class ideology.

Craft Unionism and Decay

Years of unexcelled opportunities for organizational expansion and advance brought continued stagnation. Resolutions were adopted successively at A. F. of L. annual conventions to organize the South, to organize the automobile industry and to organize the steel industry. None of them, however, was carried into actual life. The San Francisco convention two years ago went on record for the establishment of industrial unions in certain mass production industries; but this decision also remained on paper. Such organizational efforts as were made in these industries went ahead practically in spite of the official leadership and were at the outset faced with the problem of battering down the obstructions of craft union barriers. Even the great stimulus to trade union organization afforded by the beginning of the present business revival and the additional impulse given by the NRA, the bureaucratic leadership failed to utilize to advantage. Workers from basic industries streaming toward the unions were in many instances repelled. To the bureaucracy they represented simply an unruly and troublesome element. In successive strike waves it became perfectly clear that militant struggle alone could overcome the increasingly bitter and increasingly violent resistance offered by the big monopoly concerns to union organization; and the workers displayed their readiness for struggle. They proceeded to turn the unions into instruments of struggle. With this the need for mass organization grew. The very life of the trade union movement came to depend much more on mass numbers, for which the industrial form of organization alone could furnish an adequate basis. This simple conclusion, accepted by the more progressive forces, gave to the C.I.O. leaders their new prestige and power. But it also brought down on their heads the full and unmitigated fury of the craft union bureaucracy.

The greater the need for progressive change, the greater the fury. Of course, the craft union bureaucracy frowned upon all ideas of an open struggle with monopoly capitalism. It had far greater love for its own harmonious relations with these agents of privilege than it had desire for organization. The mere advocacy of industrial unionism and the launching of an active campaign by the C. I. O. to conquer the steel industry for organized labor, this bureaucracy characterized by the fantastic charge of fomenting an insurrection in the A. F. of L. Under these conditions it was manifestly impossible to find a solution to the most vital problems of the movement within the old craft union framework. The living dynamics of the movement made the conflict inevitable.

In view of these considerations we cannot escape the conclusion that in its essence the split has distinctly progressive features. This fact itself will be of decisive importance in the coming struggle for supremacy between the two rival movements. No doubt needs to remain of the incomparably more favorable position of the C. I. O. Its affiliated unions are the most cohesive and the growing unions. It has already gained the support of many state and city central organizations of the A.F. of L. Sympathizers with its ideas are numerous. It has begun to strike roots in mass production industry, and it is perfectly clear that this must become the actual basis of the future movement. Now the the C.I.O. faces its real test. It set out on a progressive course, but it can succeed only by maintaining this course. Only through the building of a movement that is powerful by virtue of mass numbers can supremacy be attained. The logic of the position now occupied by the C.I.O. leaves it no alternative other than to pursue this course.

Pursuance by the A.F. of L. of the opposite course can only hasten its own doom, which it invited when the Executive Council embarked on its splitting policy. To attain success for itself the C.I.O. will therefore be compelled to distinguish its own position sharply in many important respects from that of the A.F. of L. A return to the reactionary position of the latter would gain it no support whatever. On the contrary, the rival struggle for supremacy will tend to drive the C.I.O. unions in a leftward direction. Facing the furious opposition of the big monopoly concerns, and facing a struggle for organization in which no quarter is given, this general trend can only be reinforced. And the C.I.O. can hardly afford to retreat if it is not to give up the field to the opponents. The attempt to organize the steel industry, even if success cannot be assured in advance, will undoubtedly lead to consequences extending far beyond the question of union organization alone. This is tantamount to a challenge to the giants of industry and the giants of finance capital. The struggle for organization cannot help but become a gigantic one. It will place all the important issues of the class struggle at the very top of the agenda. In such events as these, the peculiar type of American trade unionism, now known as the remnants of the Gompers era, is bound to give way. A new type of unionism will begin to take shape. It stands to reason that these events may also give a great impetus toward the development of political consciousness among the working masses. This question is bound up also with the development of an effective revolutionary Socialist party.

C. I. O. Politically Backward

No doubt the leaders of the C.I.O. are aware of these possibilities. Some of their present efforts would indicate that much. In the field of trade union organization their position is distinctly a progressive one and it should receive the full and complete support of all revolutionary Socialists. Expressed in terms of politics it becomes clear, however, that their position on questions of basic class ideology cannot at all be termed progressive. These leaders have become the main sponsors within labors' ranks of the re-election of President Roosevelt. Basically this represents the same old capital and labor partnership idea; only in a new version. It is obviously an attempt to forestall, by new methods, the development of an independent class ideology. This becomes so much clearer by the suggestions made by these leaders, that the support to re-elect Roosevelt this year may be the forerunner of a national labor party for the next elections. The actual organization of a labor party in the state of New York for the re-election of Roosevelt also makes more clear what they intend a national labor party to be. This party is organized as a direct opponent of the Socialist party. It is organized precisely in the State of New York in order to furnish an illusory medium through which to swing workers who are socialistically inclined behind Roosevelt. As such it represents an attempt, still in embryo form, but an attempt nevertheless, to forestall revolutionary growth by swerving it into the channels so much safer for capitalism—the reformist channels. But in this we have also—still in embryo form—the beginning of a change in traditional political policy pursued by the labor movement in the past. And it represents also a beginning in opposing revolutionary growth by a large scale reformist movement.

All of these developments in the A.F. of L., from the emergence of the C.I.O., through the split to the present events, have taken place entirely without the slightest conscious influence or intervention by any of the existing workers' political parties. Obviously, this fact cannot be in the least flattering to revolutionary Socialists. For the future, however, their active and conscious intervention will become an imperative mandate.

Spain and the Campaign

BY GLEN TRIMBLE

"THE SPANISH workers are fighting with their back to the wall against Spanish Fascism, financed by German and Italian Fascism. American Socialists must respond by putting on a campaign to raise funds to help defeat Fascism where it is now expressing itself in its worst form. Liberals, progressive trade unionists, all sympathizers with the Spanish workers should be called upon for contributions to be sent to Spain through the International Federation of Trade Unions and the Labor and Socialist International, which have set up a joint fund.

"Properly handled this campaign can be used to increase Socialist support in this campaign, rather than detract from it. . . .

"The campaign to aid the Spanish workers should help to speed up class struggle education in America and emphasize our international solidarity," writes Clarence Senior, national secretary of the Socialist Party, in a letter to all branches and locals.

The Major Issue

I am convinced that the campaign to aid the Spanish workers should be the major issue of the present Presidential campaign. But certainly if it is to be "properly handled," a great deal more clarity is necessary than at present exists in party ranks.

First of all, we need a sense of proportion. What does Spain mean to the world's working class and the International Socialist movement? Already their heroic fight has spurred British, French, Belgian, American, Mexican workers to new hope of world Socialism. It has fanned into flame the smoldering ashes of working class internationalism in the Soviet Union. It has forced International fascist-capitalism to drop its cloak of patriotic nationalism and parade before the world as an international organization for the suppression of the working class. Contrariwise it has confronted the working class with the choice between counter-solidarity on a world scale or division and defeat. It has posed for the world the issue of Capitalism or Socialism.

Defeat or Victory

Defeat for the Spanish workers would mean a morale-shattering addition to the long parade of reverses that has marched steadily downward from the triumphant peak of October, 1917. Defeat will set back for many years the conquest of a workers' world.

Victory for the Spanish workers, providing that victory is promptly ratified by worker-control of a nation won by workers' arms, will mean the turning of the tide. It will give new courage, decisiveness, and a glorious example to the workers of France. Together Spanish and French workers can reach out the hands of comradeship in struggle, and lend real hope for victory, to the workers of Germany and Italy.

Again, as in the post-war days, the IMMEDIATE ISSUE for every European nation will be Capitalism or Socialism—Socialism roused from lethargy and despair, and done for all time with fatal compromise and retreat, at last taking the offensive.

The Campaign

In this world perspective the campaign in the United States is almost insignificant. Yet it is lent significance by the fact that it is, or should be, a part of the world struggle. It is the sole American expression of the issue which Spain poses for the world—Capitalism or Socialism! To separate the two, to set one against the other as an either-or choice is to fly in the face of the international character of the class struggle under modern capitalism. It would be the Socialist party of the United States, not the Marxian analysis, which would suffer by such a division.

Let us look at the record of the relations between the American campaign and the Spanish issue. First of all, we failed completely to step into the vanguard of the campaign. Our national leadership lagged behind that of locals of the party, behind Dubinsky and many other trade unionists, behind even the inept and befuddled American League Against War and Fascism. Six weeks of life-and-death struggle for the future of Europe and the world were allowed to go by without action of any significance from our NEC. The "revolutionary vanguard" failed completely to foresee or to adjust to the one issue which for weeks has wiped the presidential campaign from the headlines of the capitalist press.

Confusion

Inevitably, non-Marxian, reformist leadership has led to confusion, not clarification, of the fundamental issues of the struggle. Now that, at last, we are in, our task is to undo the confusion which exists inside as well as outside party ranks.

How shall we aid the Spanish workers? "Neutrality," say many working-class leaders in Europe and America. "Let the Spanish antagonists settle their fight without intervention from the rest of the world. Get international agreement to an embargo on arms to both sides. Do nothing to endanger neutrality." This argument rests on three false assumptions. First, that the working class of the world can or should be neutral in a fight which is fundamentally one of capitalism against socialism. Second, that the capitalist governments of the world will carry out pledges of neutrality contrary to their superficially rival imperialistic interests and their fundamentally united interest in the preservation of capitalism. Third, that appeals to honor, international law, and treaties made and administered by capitalist governments will aid the working class and limit the power of the capitalist class.

An elementary knowledge of the class struggle gives the lie to all these assumptions. Capitalism protects and defends its own; the state is its executive committee; to go begging to it is to admit defeat.

Neutrality Defined

In the light of the class character of the state, what does "neutrality" mean? Bluntly it is a state means for tying the hands of legalist leaders of the working class while giving a free hand **plus protection** to the capitalist class. Let us illustrate by what has actually happened in America, apparently remote from the scene of conflict. The State Department has satisfied the naive liberals and paficists in and out of the working class by "urging" American manufacturers not to make or ship materials of war to the combatants in Spain. Just in case some capitalist might misunderstand the "urging," on August 26, the State Department announced that it would insist on the right of American ships to land cargo in ports held by Spanish rebels. Liberals are happily blind; realistic capitalists are happily at trade; where are the realistic Marxians?

In essence, capitalist state neutrality means "free trade" by capitalists with capitalists protected by capitalist naval power. Under capitalism it can mean nothing else. The neutrality of the United States is made of the same cloth as that of "democracy-loving" capitalist Great Britain and "democracy-hating" capitalist Germany. Even "free trade" is free only for capitalists and in line with capitalist interest. The first mass effort of American workers to buy and ship arms to the workers of Spain will strip off the mask, and expose the real character of free trade "neutrality."

Arms!

Arms? "Arms" seems to be a frightful word. The National Office calls for a "Spanish Solidarity Fund," the trade unionists for "Labor's Red Cross for Spain," my correspondence with the members of the NEC brings a proposal for raising funds for "medical supplies." Why all this soft-pedaling? Pick up any capitalist paper, the right hand front column will tell you that the issue is being fought out in Spain on the basis of arms. Italian and German military planes give brutal testimony to the clarity of these governments on the issue involved. The Mexican government, a long way from a clear-cut Socialist viewpoint, is quite clear on the needs of the Spanish workers. There is no wing of Social-Democracy so lost to Marxian fundamentals as not to insist, at least by resolution, upon forceful, armed suppression of counter-revolution against a workers' government.

The Socialist party of the United States has always held at least to this minimum of class struggle realism. The last sentence of the 1936 Declaration of Principles adopted **without a dissenting voice** reads "In defense of the workers' rights and in enforcement of the democratically expressed will of the masses, the Socialist Party calls upon the workers to stand ready to meet reactionary violence with every means at their disposal." The Spanish class war is a clear-cut cause for practical demonstration in action of our traditional theoretical position. The educational advantages of this opportunity for both American Socialists and American workers are inestimable. On this subject American workers are ready to listen to "class struggle education." **NOW,** not after the campaign and after the struggle. The real question to be asked is not "Arms?" but "why not arms?"

The answers I have received to a concrete proposal of this kind sent to the NEC seem to be that it would be misunderstood by American voters, shock certain pacifists and liberals, hinder rather than help the funds to be raised and the sympathy to be won for the Spanish workers. There is a grain of truth in the argument that requires examination. Undoubtedly an open, nation-wide campaign for "Arms for the Spanish Workers" would draw a sharp class line through our society. The entire capitalist press would wax hysterical. The stark realism of arms would shock those who like to look at class relations through a rosy haze. They would be forced to take one side or the other just as they are forced to do, on a small scale, in every strike. Unless we are simon-pure parliamentarians, we are going to give that shock to them eventually anyway. This should be good training.

A Workers' Fight

But is not all this "exploiting" the cause of the Spanish workers? Boosting a campaign in the United States at the expense of the immediate and terribly pressing need of the Spanish workers? Such charges are true only if the Marxian concept of a world struggle, the requisite of world clarity, and the necessity of world independent working-class action are false. Only the workers and those who accept the workers' struggle can help Spain's workers. Only the workers, by workers' sanctions, can stop the shipment of arms to the counter-revolution in Spain. Only the workers will send arms to the **workers** of Spain (sale or arms by capitalist governments to the Spanish **Government** will be conditional on guarantees that it continue as a capitalist government).

Money for machine guns can be collected in greater volume than money for bandages, and it will mean more to both the Spanish and American working class. Arms can be delivered by, and only by, workers to the workers of Spain.

Above all, the workers **can win.** All history, all economics, is on our side, not on that of a crumbling capitalism. Our task is truly to "speed up class struggle education in America and emphasize our international solidarity"—Workers' Sanctions Against Arms to the Capitalist Counter-Revolution! Workers' Arms to the Workers of Spain!

IS THE SEMI-MONTHLY A MERE HOPE?

On the strength of the response to the September issue of the APPEAL we decided to publish two issues for the month of October. We announced that the regular issue would come out by the 15th of October. We were too optimistic and we have resolved not to make any promises for the future unless we actually have the means to fulfill those promises.

Contributions and pledges have come in but only enough to guarantee the regular publication of the APPEAL as a monthly. From Brooklyn a contribution of ten dollars; from Youngstown a comrade sent five dollars; from Chicago another comrade sent five dollars; and a twenty-five dollar contribution arrived from a suburb of Chicago and from all over the country pledges of one dollar per month were made. BUT NOT ENOUGH TO JUSTIFY INCREASING THE NUMBER OF ISSUES PER MONTH. As we said in the last issue a minimum sustaining fund of two hundred dollars per month is necessary to assure a semi-monthly. And we are far from that goal.

The printing and mailing of one issue costs one hundred and sixty five dollars. This is what we now owe to the printer and to friends. On the basis of present contributions and pledges we can afford to spend that much and no more. We therefore urge our enthusiastic supporters to make a serious efforts to get subscriptions, contributions and above all regular monthly pledges.

LEON TROTSKY

History of the Russian Revolution

(3 volumes in 1) 2.98
My Life 3.00
Towards Socialism or Capitalism (whither Russia?) 1.00
Where is Britain Going? ..... .75

Recent Pamphlets

Haim Kantorovitch—Problems of Revolutionary Socialism 10c
Felix Morrow—Civil War in Spain..... 15c
Socialism in Our Time—A Challenge to Professionals and Intellectuals 5c

We carry books and pamphlets of all publishers as well as a large selection of American and European periodicals.

A 20% discount will be given to all branches of the Socialist Party and circles of the Young Peoples Socialist League for bundle orders.

LABOR BOOK SHOP
28 East 12th Street, N.Y.C.

SOCIALIST APPEAL
EDITORIAL BOARD
Ernest Erber - Albert Goldman - Rudolph C. Olson
Business Mgr.
RUDOLPH C. OLSON
1654 W. 67th St. Chicago, Ill.
Subscription Rates: one dollar for 24 issues; fifty cents for twelve issues.
Bundle Orders—Five or More—Three Cents per Copy